



7-25-09

I fu

hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Service Express Mail: EB 564160176 US, postage prepaid and addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date set forth below.

Date of Signature and Mailing: July 22, 2009

John C. Abendroth, Inventor and Applicant:

PATENT

Docket No. 100036.00002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: John C. Abendroth, Inventor and Applicant
11225 N. Prairie View Lane
Mequon, WI 53092
(414) 517-3101 Cell Phone
E-mail: jabendroth@jcambax.com

Initial submittals by: Michael J. McGovern
Quarles & Brady, LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5725
Prior Attorney of Record

Appl. No.: 09/751,121

Filed: December 26, 2000

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR E-COMMERCE
FREIGHT MANAGEMENT

Art Unit: 3624

Examiner: Ella Colbert
(571) 272-6741
(571) 273-8300 Organization Fax

Examiner's Supervisor: Vincent Millin
(571) 272-6747

REPLY TO THE OFFICE ACTION MAILED ON JUNE 24, 2009

Reply to Office Action

Appl. No.: 09/751,121 Art Unit: 3624

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: Re-filing my response to The United States Patent and Trademark Office Action of December 10, 2008 asserting that claims 32-38, 41-46, 48-51, 57-60, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs. With having corrected the objections, I have now additionally removed the specification amendments from the Remarks section and placed them on separate pages, per the June 24, 2009 Office Action.

Sir:

This re-reply is In response to the Office Action by The United States Patent and Trademark Office mailed on December 10, 2008, including my completing the requested changes made to correct the improper informalities in Claims 32, 36, 41, and 46 and addressing The United States Patent and Trademark Office's responses indicating drawing figure and specification numbering irregularities or missing or inconsistent references along with Claims 32-38, 41-46, 48-51, 57-60, and 63 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Due to the aforementioned The United States Patent and Trademark Office has considered my arguments with respect to Claims 32-68 moot in view of these new ground(s) of rejection. With the correction of the above and now with the removal of the specification amendments from the Remarks section this Reply continues to argue that my Method and System for E-Commerce Freight Management contains inventive steps over all of the purported prior art and reasserts my 87 page, August 11, 2008 Reply to the Office Action mailed on February 11, 2008.